Appendix 5:
FY 2000 IHDEP Grant Application
Summary Sheet
Budget Input Data Sheet
Score Sheets
Scoring Instructions

# FY 2000 INDIAN HOUSING DRUG ELIMINATION PROGRAM (IHDEP) SCORE SHEET OFFICE OF NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Tribe/TDHE Name			_
Tribal Code (if any)			_
AONAP Code			_
Funds Requested: \$			
Projected Funds Approved \$			
Factor 1:	Max 20 points		
Factor 2:	Max 30 points		
Factor 3:	Max 35 points		
Factor 4:	Max 10 points		
Factor 5:	Max 10 points		
Grand Total Score:			
Maximum Points Possible: 105			
ONAP-National Review Center Reviewer S	ignature	 Date	
Team Leader Signature		- Date	
ONAP-National Review Center Administrat		_	Date
		_	

Date

#### Appendix 5

#### BUDGET DATA INPUT SHEET FY 2000 IHDEP

#### Instructions:

This sheet is to be completed using information from the SF-424A, Budget Information, with Budget Narrative and supporting documentation found in the FY 2000 Application Kit.

AONAPs shall complete the third column (funds requested) and submit completed score sheets for each application.

The ONAP-National Review Center (NRC) staff will complete the fourth column (ONAP-NRC approved amount) once Factors 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been scored, and ineligible activities and/or costs have been identified.

Sections 2 and 3 of the Budget Input Sheet identify ineligible activities or costs and special conditions if the application is funded. To the extent AONAPs identify ineligible activities/costs and/or special conditions during the rating of Factor 1 shall be noted on this form. ONAP-NRC staff will add to ineligible activities and special conditions as necessary, upon completion of reviewing Factors 2, 3, 4 and 5.

### BUDGET DATA INPUT SHEET FY 2000 IHDEP

#### **SECTION 1**

TRIBE/T	DHE NAME:		
TRIBAL	CODE (if any)		
ITEM	ACTIVITY	FUNDS REQUESTED	ONAP-NATIONAL REVIEW CENTER APPROVED AMT
9110	Reimbursement of Law Enforce- ment	\$	\$
TOTAL	9110 BLI FUNDING	G \$	\$
9120	Employment of Security Personnel	\$	\$
	Tribal employed security guards	\$	\$
	Contracted security guards	·	\$
	Tribal Police Dept	t. \$	\$
TOTAL	9120 BLI FUNDING	G <b>\$</b>	\$

9130	Employment of Investigators	\$	\$	
9140	Voluntary Tenant Patrols	\$	\$	
9150	Physical Improvements	\$		\$
PROGRA	MS TO REDUCE	ILLEGAL DRUG	SS	
9160	Drug Prevention	\$	\$	
9170	Drug Intervention	\$	\$	
9180	Drug Treatment	\$	\$	
GRANT A	ADMINISTRATIV	E COSTS		
9190	Other Program Costs	\$	\$	
TOTAL I	FUNDS REQUES	STED		
		\$	\$	
	e, total funding after s listed in Section 2		\$	
AONAP-GA	Signature		 Date	
ONAP-Nation	nal Review Center Admi	nistrator Signature	Date	

#### **BUDGET DATA INPUT SHEET**

#### SECTION 2 INELIGIBLE IHDEP ACTIVITIES

TRIBE/TDHE NAME:
TRIBAL CODE
List any ineligible items by activity and cost objective from budget and deduct from the requested funding amount. All deductions must be justified with comment by the scorer and verified by the AONAP-National Review Center Administrator.
INELIGIBLE ACTIVITY/COST:
Amount:
Page #:
Justification:
INELIGIBLE ACTIVITY/COST:
Amount:
Page #:
Justification:

#### **BUDGET DATA INPUT SHEET**

### SECTION 3 SPECIAL CONDITIONS

If applicable, Special Conditions to Grant Agreement (Form HUD-
1044 completed by ONAP-NRC and AONAP staff)

TRIBE/TDHE NAME:	 
TRIBAL CODE:	 
<b>SPECIAL CONDITIONS:</b>	

#### APPENDIX 5 FY 2000 IHDEP SCORING FACTORS FACTOR 1

(to be completed by AONAPs)

APPLICANT NAME:		
TRIBE/TDHE CODE:		
CAPACITY OF THE APPLICANT AND RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE MAXIMUM POINTS: 20		
1. The knowledge and experience of staff in ma (10 points maximum)	anaging grants	
2. Past performance in administering Drug Elin and/or other Federal, state or local grants of complexity during the last (3) years (10 points)	similar size and	
TOTAL (20 points maximum)		
A detailed description of each sub-factor follow rated, write in the scores above, then total.	vs. After they have been individually	
AONAP-Reviewer Signature	Date	
AONAP-GA Signature	Date	

### 1. KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE OF STAFF IN MANAGING GRANTS (10 POINTS)

Reviewers should consider physical inspections, monitoring/evaluation records, audit records, narrative and financial status reports prepared by the grantee, complaints from citizens/contractors and LOCCS reports. When making comments please indicate the Tab and/or page number in the application containing the information on which comments and score are based.

STRENGTHS	Tab/Page#
WEAKNESSES	Tab/Pages#
Points Assigned:	

## 2. PAST PERFORMANCE IN ADMINISTERING DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS AND/OR OTHER FEDERAL, STATE, OR LOCAL GRANTS (10 POINTS)

Consider the applicant's past experience/ability to track drug-related crime, screening/lease procedures, success in implementing planned activities, success in achieving program goals/objectives, timely drawdown of funds, timely submission of required reports and audit compliance.

STRENGTHS	Tab/Page#
WEAKNESSES	Tab/Pages#
D ' 4 A ' 1	
Points Assigned:	

### FY 2000 IHDEP SCORING FACTORS FACTOR 2

(to be completed by ONAP-NRC Reviewers)

APPLICANT NAME:			
TRIBE/TDHE CODE: DATE OF REVIEW:			
NEED/EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM MAXIMUM POINTS: 30			
This factor examines the extent to which there is a need for funding the proposed program activities to address a documented problem in the applicant's targeted area (i.e. the degree of the severity of the drug-related crime problem in the project proposed for funding). It is divided into two sub-factors. Reviewers please note: up to a total of 5 points will be awarded if substantial information is provided as to why Objective Crime data could not be obtained. Please score accordingly:			
Objective Crime Data relevant to target area     (15 points maximum)			
(a) Substantial information has been provided as to why Objective Crime Data could not be obtained (5 points maximum)			
2. Other data supporting the extent of drug and drug-related crime (15 points maximum)			
ΓΟΤΑL (30 points maximum)			
A detailed description of each sub-factor follows. After they have been individually rated, write in the scores above, then total.			
DNAP-National Review Center Reviewer Signature Date			
AONAP-GA Signature Date			

#### 1. OBJECTIVE CRIME DATA (15 POINTS)

Reviewers shall consider submission of verifiable (not anecdotal) records. Where appropriate, statistics should be reported both in real numbers and as an annual percentage of the residents in each development (e.g. 20 arrests in a two-year period for distribution of heroin in a development with 100 residents reflects a 20% occurrence rate). Refer to type and quality of data, as described below, when assigning points.

Choose and assign points to one of the following of	categories:
(11-15 points) Applicant provides <b>the best</b> the problem, thoroughly documents crime statistics Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) Parts 1 and 2 standactivity, including where and to whom it is sold and	s by listing types of crime by dards, clearly defines drug
(6-10 points) Applicant outlines or analyzes nature and frequency of crime, includes some crim other crime and their nature and frequency, and de drug activity.	ne statistics, lists drug-related and
(0-5 points) Applicant provides <b>little or no</b> data, crime statistics by type of crime, or description	<b>S</b>
STRENGTHS	Tab/Page#

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page‡
------------	-----------

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_Factor 2

#### **1(a). OBJECTIVE CRIME DATA (5 POINTS)**

**STRENGTHS** 

Reviewers shall consider submission of substantial information that has been provided as to why Objective Crime Data could not be obtained; the efforts being made to obtain it; what efforts will be made during the grant period to begin obtaining the data; and an explanation of how the applicant plans to measure how grant activities will result in reducing drug-related crime in the targeted developments and what will be used as a baseline.

Tab/Page#

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page#
Points Assigned:	
Factor 2	
1 4001 2	

### OTHER DATA SUPPORTING THE EXTENT OF DRUG AND DRUG-RELATED CRIME (15 POINTS)

To the extent objective as described above may not be available, or to complement that data, applicant must use data from other verifiable sources that have a direct bearing on drug-related crime in developments proposed for assistance under this program. However, if other relevant information is to be used in place of objective data, the application must indicate reasons why objective data could not be obtained and what efforts were made to obtain it, and will be made during the grant period to begin obtaining the data and an explanation of how the applicant plans to measure how grant activities will result in reducing drug-related crime in the targeted developments and what will be used as a baseline.

Other data may include surveys of residents and staff in targeted developments, research/government studies, vandalism costs, information from schools, health providers, residents, and government officials; school drop-out rate and level of absenteeism for youth as it relates to drug-related crime; the number of lease terminations or evictions for drug-related crime at targeted developments; the number of emergency room admissions for drug use or that result from drug-related crime; the number of police calls for service from tribe/TDHE developments (e.g. domestic violence, calls, drug distribution complaints, gang activity) and verifiable opinions/observations of individuals having direct knowledge of drug-related crime and nature and frequency of problems in developments proposed for assistance.

#### 2. OTHER DATA SUPPORTING THE EXTENT OF DRUG AND DRUG-RELATED CRIME (15 POINTS) (continued)

Choose and assign points to one of the following categories:
(11-15 points) Applicant includes other documentation as described above to complement objective data or thoroughly and reasonably explains why such documentation could not be obtained, what efforts were made to obtain it and will be made to obtain it in the future; other data submitted <b>clearly</b> describes the nature and frequency of crime, and has a direct bearing on drug-related crime in the development proposed for assistance.
(6-10 points) Applicant includes <b>some</b> of the other documentation as described above, includes other documentation which partially describes the natural frequency of crime and/or types of crime including drug-related and other crimes; and/or provides drug activity by whom it is being sold to, where and how it sold, and how drug markets are operating.
(0-5 points) Applicant provides <b>little or no</b> evidence of additional supporting documentation as described above.
STRENGTHS Tab/Page#

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page#

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

### FY 2000 IHDEP SCORING FACTORS FACTOR 3

(to be completed by ONAP-NRC Reviewers)

APP	LICANT NAME:
TRI	BE/TDHE CODE:
DAT	ΓE OF REVIEW:
	SOUNDNESS OF APPROACH/QUALITY OF PLAN MAXIMUM POINTS: 35
	factor addresses the quality and effectiveness of the applicant's proposed plan etermining if there are tangible benefits.
	The strength of the plan to address the drug-related e problem
(a)	The extent to which the applicant has stated  (i) Performance goals that will measure program outcomes and  (ii) The actual baseline data which will establish a starting point for how outcomes will be measured and expected results; what performance measurement system currently exists for providing information on established outcome goals  (7 points maximum)
(b)	The extent to which the applicant has designed major activities to meet measurable goals and objectives for drug related crime reduction (7 points maximum)  —————
c d	(c) The extent to which the applicant has defined specific, measurable program goals (7 points maximum)
(d)	The rationale for your proposed activities and methods used including evidence that proposed activities have been effective

	(7 points maximum)		
(e)	Evidence of existing youth programs and reduce substance abuse among youth (7 points maximum)	d activities to	_
TOT	AL: (35 points maximum)		_
	etailed description of each sub-factor follows, write in the scores above, then total.	ws. After they have been individuall	y
ONA	P-National Review Center Reviewer Signature	Date	
AON	AP-GA Signature	 Date	

#### 1. STRENGTH OF THE PLAN—Section 1(a)(i) and (ii)

Reviewers shall consider the quality of the applicants' plan to address the drugrelated crime problem, the problems associated with drug related crime in the developments proposed for funding, the resources allocated, and how well the proposed activities fit with the plan. (7 points)

Choose and assign points to one of the following categories: (5-7 points) the applicant **clearly demonstrated a capability** to effectively and efficiently address the drug-related crime problem and the problems associated with drug-related crime in developments proposed for funding, allocate resources, and fit proposed activities with the plan. Applicant has included performance goals to measure program outcomes and baseline data. Applicant showed evidence that a performance measurement system exists for providing information to HUD on progress made in achieving outcome goals. \_(1-4 points) the applicant demonstrated **fair ability** to effectively and efficiently address the drug-related crime problem and the problems associated with drug-related crime in developments proposed for funding, allocate resources, and fit proposed activities with the plan. Applicant has included some performance goals to measure program outcomes and baseline data. Applicant showed some evidence that a performance measurement system exists for providing information to HUD on progress made in achieving outcome goals. (0 points) the applicant demonstrated **no ability** to address the drug-related crime problem and the problems associated with drug-related crime in developments proposed for funding, allocate resources, and fit proposed activities with the plan. Applicant has not included performance goals to measure program outcomes and baseline data. Applicant showed no evidence that a performance measurement system exists for providing information to HUD on progress made in achieving outcome goals.

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page#
MEWVINEDDED	Tab/ Page#
Doints Assigned	
Points Assigned:	

STRENGTHS

Tab/Page#

### 2. ACTIVITIES: MEASURABLE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Section 1(b)

Reviewers shall consider the extent to which the applicant has designed major activities to meet measurable goals and objectives for drug-related crime reduction. Reviewers shall also determine whether the outcomes include accomplishments, results in targeted area. The goals must be objective, quantifiable, and/or qualitative so that at the end of the 24-month grant term one can determine if the activities were effective. (7 points)

Choose and assign points to one of the following categories:
(5-7 points) Applicant has <b>clearly</b> designed major activities to meet measurable goals and objectives for drug-related crime reduction. Outcomes include accomplishments, results in targeted area. The goals are objective, quantifiable, and/or qualitative.
(1-4 points) Applicant has designed <b>some</b> major activities to meet measurable goals and objectives for drug-related crime reduction. Outcomes include accomplishments, results in targeted area. The goals are somewhat objective, quantifiable, and/or qualitative.
(0 points) the applicant provided <b>no</b> documentation that major activities are designed to meet measurable goals and objectives for drug-related crime reduction Outcomes do not include accomplishments, results in targeted area. The goals are not objective, quantifiable, and/or qualitative.
STRENGTHS Tab/Page#

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page#

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

### 2. CRIME REDUCTION: MEASUARABLE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES Section 1(c) (7 points maximum)

Reviewers shall score based on the extent to which the applicant has defined specific crime reduction goals that are measurable. For example, a goal of, "reducing part 1 reported homicides or Part II drug abuse, etc. by 5% in development X by the end of the 24-month grant period based on measurements against the baseline year crime selection rate in the targeted development X as stated in the application" is measurable and specific.

Choose and assign points to one of the following categories:	
(5-7 points) Applicant <b>clearly</b> defines specific crime reduction goals that measurable against the baseline year crime selection rate, as stated in the application.	at are
(1-4 points) Applicant provides <b>some</b> examples of crime reduction goal are measurable against the baseline year crime selection rate, as stated in the application.	s that
(0 points) Applicant <b>did not</b> provide specific crime reduction goals that measurable against the baseline year crime selection rate, as stated in the application.	at are
STRENGTHS Tab/Page:	#

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_Factor 3

#### 4. RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED ACTIVITIES Section 1(d)

Reviewers will consider the rationale for proposed activities and methods used, including evidence that proposed activities have been effective in similar circumstances in controlling drug-related crime. (7 points)

Choose and assign points to one of the fo	llowing categories:
(5-7 points) Applicant <b>clearly</b> demo been effective in similar circumstances.	nstrates that the proposed activities have
(1-4 points) Applicant provides <b>som</b> proposed programs have been effective in related crime.	
(0 points) Applicant provides <b>no</b> exbeen effective in similar situations in contra	vidence that the proposed programs have colling drug-related crime.
STRENGTHS	Tab/Page#

WEAKNESSES Ta
---------------

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

# 5. EVIDENCE OF EXISTING YOUTH PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES THAT REDUCE SUBSTANCE ABUSE AMONG YOUTH AND OTHER PROGRAMS (7 points maximum)

Reviewers must consider evidence provided by the applicant of existing youth programs and activities to reduce substance abuse among youth in the tribal community.

community.	10ai
Choose and assign points to one of the following categories:	
(5-7 points) Applicant clearly demonstrates/provides evidence that programs and activities that reduce substance abuse among youth, afterconservices, social services, programs to reduce delinquency, gang prevention academic improvement programs, counseling and conflict resolution, have coordinated in the tribal community.	are on,
(1-4 points) the applicant provides some evidence and documentation youth programs and activities that reduce substance abuse among youth, services, social services, programs to reduce delinquency, gang prevention academic improvement programs, counseling and conflict resolution, have coordinated in the tribal community.	aftercare on,
(0 points) Applicant provides little or no evidence and documentary youth programs and activities that reduce substance abuse among youth, services, social services, programs to reduce delinquency, gang prevention academic improvement programs, counseling and conflict resolution, have coordinated in the tribal community.	aftercare on,
STRENGTHS Tab/Pa	age#

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page‡
------------	-----------

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

### FY 2000 IHDEP SCORING FACTORS FACTOR 4

(to be completed by ONAP-NRC Reviewer)

APPLICANT NAME:	
TRIBE/TDHE CODE:	
DATE OF REVIEW:	
LEVERAGING RESOURCES SUPPORT OF RESIDENTS, THE LOCAL GOV AND THE COMMUNITY IN PLANNII AND IMPLEMENTING THE PROPOSED ACTIVIT	NG
This factor addresses the applicant's ability to secure commuresources that can be combined with HUD's program resources program purposes.	•
1. Evidence of firm commitment (3 points maximum)	
<ul> <li>2. Leveraging of resources including <ul> <li>a) Role of residents and community in planning (2 poin maximum)</li> <li>b) Evidence of community involvement and plans for o Involvement in plan planning and implementation. (2 poin maximum)</li> <li>c) Extent to which local law enforcement obligations has met (3 points maximum)</li> <li>————————————————————————————————————</li></ul></li></ul>	n-going ints
ONAP-National Review Center Reviewer Signature Date	
AONAP-GA Signature Date	

#### 1. EVIDENCE OF FIRM COMMITMENT—(3 points maximum)

Reviewers shall determine the extent to which the application demonstrates the existence of written commitment for the above resources; describes partnership in other governmental anti-drug related crime efforts; and/or successful coordination of its law enforcement with other governmental law enforcement agencies.

The applicant shall provide written evidence of firm commitment of funding, staff, or in-kind resources, partnership agreements, and on-going or planned cooperative efforts with law enforcement agencies, local, State, tribal or national entities who have committed services through a memoranda of understanding (MOU), or memorandum of agreements (MOA) to participate. Such commitments must be signed by an official of the organization legally able to make commitments for the organization.

The evidence of commitment must include organization name, resources, and responsibilities of each participant to increase the effectiveness of the proposed program activities. The signed written agreement may be contingent upon an applicant receiving a grant award.

Choose and assign points to one of the following categories:

\_\_\_\_\_(3 points) Applicant clearly documents firm, written commitments;
MOAs/MOUs include organization name and resources; and the applicant clearly describes other partnerships and successful coordination of law enforcement and other activities.

\_\_\_\_\_\_(1-2 points) Applicant provides some documentation, written commitments; MOAs/MOUs include organization name and resources; and the applicant adequately describes other partnerships and successful coordination of law enforcement and other activities.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(0 points) Applicant provided no documentation, or written commitments; MOAs/MOUs do not exist or are not signed; did not include organization name and resources; and the applicant did not describe other partnerships and successful coordination of law enforcement and other activities.

STRENGTHS	Tab/Page#
WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page#
Points Assigned:	

### 2a. LEVERAGING RESOURCES—Role of Residents and Community (2 points maximum)

Reviewers shall consider the extent to which these initiatives are used to leverage resources from the tribe/TDHE community and are part of a comprehensive plan and performance measures outlines in rating factor 3: Soundness of Approach—Quality of the plan. The applicant must describe the role of residents and community leaders and organizations in planning the activities described in the application

Choose and assign points to one of the following categories:		
(2 points) Applicant <b>clearly</b> described and what role residents played in the targeted developm leaders and organizations, law enforcement and what implementing such activities	nents, applicable community	
(1 point) applicant <b>adequately</b> described a documentation of what role residents played in the applicable community leaders and organizations, lathey will have in implementing such activities	targeted developments,	
(0 points) applicant <b>did not describe or</b> role residents played in the targeted developments, and organizations, law enforcement and what role the such activities	applicable community leaders	
STRENGTHS	Tab/Page#	

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page‡
------------	-----------

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

### 2b. LEVERAGING RESOURCES—Evidence of Community Involvement and Plans to Continue (2 points maximum)

Applicant shall provide written evidence of the extent to which community representatives were involved in the design and implementation of the plan and will continue to be involved during the implementation of proposed activities.

Choose and assign points to one of the following categories: (2 points) Applicant clearly describes and includes a discussion and written evidence (i.e. resident comments, community meeting minutes) of the extent to which community representatives and tribal, local, State and Federal Government officials, including law enforcement were actively involved in the design and implementation of the plan and will continue to be involved. \_(1 point) Applicant **adequately** provides one of the following: a discussion or written evidence (i.e. resident comments, community meeting minutes) of the extent to which community representatives and tribal, local, State and Federal Governmental officials, including law enforcement were actively involved in plan design and implementation plan and will continue to be involved. (0 points) applicant **did not** describe or provide discussion or written evidence (i.e. comments form residents, minutes from community meetings) of the extent to which community representatives and tribal, local, State and Federal Government officials, including law enforcement were actively involved in the design and implementation of the plan and will continue to be involved. **STRENGTHS** Tab/Page#

28

EAKNESSES Tab/Page
TAN/INDOED TAD/ FA

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

#### Factor 4

### **2c** LEVERAGING RESOURCES—Law Enforcement Obligations (3 points maximum)

Reviewers shall consider the extent to which the relevant governmental jurisdiction has met its local law enforcement obligations under the Cooperation Agreement. Applicant must describe baseline services being provided to the developments proposed for assistance.

proposed for assistance.	
Choose and assign points to one of the following	owing categories:
(3 points) Applicant <b>clearly</b> demonstrelevant governmental jurisdiction has met the under the Cooperation Agreement. Applicant services being provided to the development	te local law enforcement obligations at has provided a description of baseline
(1-2 points) Applicant <b>adequately</b> evidence that relevant governmental jurisdict obligations under the Cooperation Agreement of baseline services being provided to the decomposition.	ion has met the local law enforcement nt. Applicant provides some description
(0 points) Applicant has <b>not</b> demonstrated in the cooperation Agreement. Applicant being provided to the developments proposed	nt does not describe baseline services
STRENGTHS	Tab/Page#

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page‡
------------	-----------

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

## FY 2000 IHDEP SCORING FACTORS FACTOR 5

(to be completed by ONAP-NRC Reviewers)

APPLICANT NAME:	
TRIBE/TDHE CODE:	
DATE OF REVIEW:	
COMPREHENSIVENESS A MAXIMUM P	
This factor examines the extent to which the with other known organizations, and is work holistic and comprehensive manner through community. It is divided into three sub-fac	king toward addressing a need in a linkages with other activities in your
1. Demonstration of existing coordination v groups and organizations. (4 points maxi	
2. Participation in tribe/TDHE's IHBG and activities with IHP plan (3 points maximum)	
3. Steps taken to develop a) other HUD-fur Federal, State, or local linkages to promo comprehensive solutions. (3 points maximum)	ote
TOTAL (10 points maximum)	
A detailed description of each sub-factor fol rated, write in the scores above, then total.	lows. After they have been individually
ONAP-National Review Center Reviewer Signature	Date
AONAP-GA Signature	 Date

#### Factor 5

## 1. DEMONSTRATION OF EXISTING COORDINATION WITH AREA GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS—(4 points maximum)

Reviewers shall consider the extent to which the applicant demonstrates the coordination of proposed activities with those of other groups or organizations prior to submission of application in order to best complement, support, and address community needs identified in Factor 2.

with area organizations or groups. Applican MOAs.	t does not include or describe MOUs or
(0 points) Applicant does not demon	
(1-2 points) Applicant <b>adequately de</b> coordination of activities with area organizat support, and address community needs. The MOUs and MOAs that are or will be in place	ions and groups, which complement, applicant describes and includes
(3-4 points) Applicant <b>clearly demo</b> coordination of activities with area organizat support, and address community needs. The MOUs and MOAs that are or will be in place	ions and groups, which complement, applicant describes and includes
Choose and assign points to one of the follo	wing categories:

WEAKNESSES	Ta	b/Page‡
------------	----	---------

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

### 2. PARTICIPATION IN TRIBE/TDHE'S IHBG AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES WITH IHP PLAN—(3 points maximum)

The reviewer will score based on the extent to which the applicant demonstrates steps taken to participate in the tribe/TDHE's Indian Housing Block Grant (IHBG) process and proves that proposed activities reflect the priorities, needs, concerns, and goals of crime prevention and safety in the Indian Housing Plan.

STRENGTHS	Tab/Page#
(0 points) Applicant <b>does not</b> demo participate in the tribe/TDHE's IHBG proc proposed activities are consistent with the crime prevention and safety in the communication.	cess. Applicant does not prove that priorities, needs, concerns, and goals of
(1 point) Applicant <b>adequately</b> demothe tribe/TDHE's IHBG process and prove with the priorities, needs, concerns, and go community's Indian Housing Plan.	± ±
(2-3 points) Applicant <b>clearly</b> demothe tribe/TDHE's IHBG process and prove with the priorities, needs, concerns, and go community's Indian Housing Plan.	1 1
Choose and assign points to one of the foll	owing categories:
and Sours of classe broadings and source, and	<u> </u>

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page#	ı
------------	-----------	---

Points Assigned:\_\_\_\_\_

## 3. STEPS TAKEN TO DEVELOP FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL OR OTHER HUD LINKAGES TO PROMOTE COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTIONS—(3 Points Maximum)

Reviewer shall score based on the extent to which the applicant demonstrates the specific steps taken to develop linkages to coordinate comprehensive solutions through meetings, information networks, planning processes or other mechanisms with a) other HUD-funded projects/activities outside the scope of those covered by the IHP; and b) other Federal State, or locally funded activities, including those proposed, or on-going that will sustain a comprehensive system to address the needs of the community.

Choose and assign points to one of the following categories: (2-3 points) Applicant clearly demonstrates specific steps taken to develop linkages to coordinate comprehensive solutions with other HUD-funded projects/activities outside the scope of those covered by the IHP; and other Federal State, or locally funded activities, including those proposed, or on-going that will sustain a comprehensive system to address the needs of the community. Steps taken may include meetings, information networks, planning processes or other mechanisms. (1 point) Applicant **adequately** demonstrates steps taken to develop linkages to coordinate comprehensive solutions with other HUD-funded projects/activities outside the scope of the IHP; or other Federal State, or locally funded activities. (0 points) Applicant **does not** demonstrate or has not taken steps to develop linkages with other HUD-funded projects/activities outside the scope of those covered by the IHP; or other Federal State, or locally funded activities. **STRENGTHS** Tab/Page#

WEAKNESSES	Tab/Page#
Points Assigned:	

#### **APPENDIX: 5**

"HIGH," "MEDIUM," AND "LOW" SCORING GUIDANCE

# Instructions For FY 2000 IHDEP AONAP And ONAP-National Review Center Grant Application Reviewers

#### SELECTIVE CRITERIA RATING FACTORS 1 THROUGH 5

### Recommended Reviewer "HIGH," "MEDIUM," "LOW," Point Distribution

Below is a **guide** given to each reviewer to help illustrate the scoring criteria for selective criteria 1 through 5 of the IHDEP grant application. The criterion is broken into three different point categories on what would constitute a "**High**", "**Medium"**, and "**Low"** score. In reviewing an application, if reviewers find that it does not fall neatly into one of these categories, based on the text provided, refer to the FY 2000 IHDEP NOFA for complete scoring selective criteria.

## FIRST SELECTIVE CRITERION CAPACITY OF THE APPLICANT AND RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE—Maximum Allowable Points: 20

Subfactor 1 - Knowledge and experience of the staff and administrative capability to manage grants of this size: 10 points

#### **High Points (8-10)**

The applicant **clearly demonstrated and provided evidence** that their staff has significant experience and administrative capability to manage grants of this size and type. This includes reviewer consideration of physical inspections, monitoring/evaluation records, audit records, narrative and financial status reports prepared by the grantee, complaints from citizens/contractors and LOCCS reports.

The applicant has also demonstrated fiscal amendment capacity and provided evidence of administrative support and organizational lines of authority.

#### **Medium Points (7-4)**

The applicant demonstrated satisfactory or **fair ability** to effectively manage their grants from HUD and other State, local, Federal agencies and experience of staff is adequate. Some fiscal management capacity.

#### Low Points (3-0)

The applicant demonstrated a **lack of ability** to effectively manage their grants from HUD or other State, local, Federal agencies and experience of staff is insufficient

Subfactor 2- Past performance in administering Drug Elimination grants and/or other Federal, State, local grants of similar size and complexity during the last three years: 10 points

#### **High Points (11-15)**

The applicant has an **extensive performance history** in administering DEP grants and/or other Federal, State or local grants of similar size and complexity during the last three years. The applicant has discussed/provided evidence of successfully implementing planned activities, achieving program goals, submitting required reports, timely drawdown of funds and no unresolved findings exist.

#### **Medium Points (10-6)**

The applicant has **some performance history** in administering DEP grants and/or other Federal, State or local grants of similar size and complexity during the last three years. The applicant has discussed/provided **some** evidence of successfully implementing planned activities, achieving program goals, submitting required reports, timely drawdown of funds and no unresolved findings exist.

#### Low Points (5-0)

The applicant demonstrated a **lack of ability** to effectively manage their grants from HUD or other State, local, Federal agencies. The applicant does not have a strong performance history in administering DEP grants, in implementing planned

activities, achieving program goals, submitting required reports, timely drawdown of funds and unresolved findings exist.

### SECOND SELECTIVE CRITERION. NEED/EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM—Maximum Allowable Points: 30

Subfactor 1 - Objective Crime Data relevant to target area: 15 points

#### **High Points (11-15)**

The applicant has **thoroughly documented and clearly demonstrated** the need and the extent of the problem in their proposed target area (i.e., the degree of the severity and nature of the drug-related crime problem in the project proposed for funding). The statistical data provided by the applicant is specific to the targeted site. The applicant has included the most current and specific Part I and relevant Part II crime data available from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting system or the local law enforcement's crime statistics. See NOFA page 30508, Rating Factor 2 for description of Part I and II crimes.

#### **Medium Points (10-6)**

The applicant has **demonstrated satisfactorily and fairly** the need and extent of the problem in their proposed target area (i.e., the degree of the severity of the drug-related crime problem in the project proposed for funding). The data provided by the applicant is not current and specific Part I and relevant Part II crime data available from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting system or is tribe/TDHE-wide data versus for the targeted development(s) for assistance.

#### Low Points (5-0)

The applicant has **not demonstrated** the need or the extent of the problem in their proposed target area (i.e., the degree of the severity of the drug-related crime problem in the project proposed for funding). The data provided by the applicant is not current and specific Part I and relevant Part II crime data available from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting system or is tribe/TDHE-wide data versus for the targeted development(s) for assistance.

\* Note Reviewers: 5 points will be awarded if substantial information is provided as to why Objective Crime Data could not be obtained; the efforts being made to obtain it; what efforts will be made during the grant period to begin obtaining the data; and an explanation of how the applicant plans to measure how grant activities will result in reducing drug-related crime in the targeted developments and what will be used as a baseline.

### Subfactor 2: Other Data Supporting The Extent Of Drug And Drug-Related Crime—15 points

#### **High Points (11-15)**

The applicant has **thoroughly documented and clearly demonstrated** in their proposed plan the problem in their proposed target area and has identified supporting data indicating the extent of drugs and drug-related crime problems in the developments proposed for assistance in their program. The applicant has included examples of data such as surveys of residents and staff in their targeted area about drugs and drug-related crime or on-site reviews to determine drug/crime activity; government or scholarly studies or other research in the past year that analyze drug-related crime activity; annual vandalism costs to the targeted development; information from schools, health service providers, residents and Federal, State, local and tribal officials; the school dropout rate and level of absenteeism; the number of lease terminations or evictions for drug-related crime at the targeted development; the number of emergency room admissions for drug use that result from drug-related crime; the number of police calls for service from the tribe/TDHE development(s).

#### **Medium Points (10-6)**

The applicant has **satisfactorily demonstrated** in their plan the problem in their proposed target area and has identified supporting data indicating the extent of drugs and drug-related crime problems in the developments proposed for assistance in their program. The applicant has include **some but not all of the following** examples of data such as surveys of residents and staff in their targeted area about drugs and drug-related crime or on-site reviews to determine drug/crime activity; government or scholarly studies or other research in the past year that analyze drug-related crime activity; annual vandalism costs to the targeted development; information from schools, health service providers, residents and Federal, State, local and tribal officials; the school dropout rate and level of absenteeism; the number of lease terminations or evictions for drug-related crime at the targeted development; the number of emergency room admissions for drug use that result from drug-related crime; the number of police calls for service from the tribe/TDHE development(s).

#### Low Points (5-0)

The applicant has **not demonstrated** in their proposed plan the problem in their proposed target area and has not identified supporting data indicating the extent of drugs and drug-related crime problems in the developments proposed for assistance in their program. The applicant has **not included any of the following** examples of data such as surveys of residents and staff in their targeted area about drugs and drug-related crime or on-site reviews to determine drug/crime activity; government or scholarly studies or other research in the past year that analyze drug-related crime activity; annual vandalism costs to the targeted development; information from schools, health service providers, residents and Federal, State, local and tribal officials; the school dropout rate and level of absenteeism; the number of lease terminations or evictions for drug-related crime at the targeted development; the number of emergency room admissions for drug use that result from drug-related crime; the number of police calls for service from the tribe/TDHE development(s).

## THIRD SELECTIVE CRITERION THE SOUNDNESS OF APPROACH (QUALITY OF THE PLAN)— Maximum Allowable Points: 35 Points

Subfactor 3-A, SECTION V(B)(Rating Factor 3)(1)(a)(i) and (ii) of the IHDEP NOFA: Maximum total points: 7

#### **High Points (5-7)**

The applicant **clearly demonstrated a capability** to effectively and efficiently address the drug-related crime problem, the problems associated with drug-related crime in developments proposed for funding, allocate resources, and fit the proposed activities with the plan. Applicant has included performance goals to measure program outcomes and baseline data. Applicant has stated what performance measurement system exists for providing information to HUD on progress made in achieving outcome goals.

#### **Medium Points (1-4)**

The applicant demonstrated satisfactory or **fair ability** to effectively and efficiently address the drug-related crime problem, the problems associated with drug-related crime in developments proposed for funding, the resources allocated, and how well the proposed activities fit with the plan. Applicant has included some performance goals to measure program outcomes and baseline data. Applicant showed some evidence that a performance measurement system exists for providing information to HUD on progress made in achieving outcome goals.

#### Low Points (0)

The applicant **did not document or efficiently address** the drug-related crime problem, the problems associated with drug-related crime in developments proposed for funding, the resources allocated, and how well the proposed activities fit with the plan. Applicant has not included performance goals to measure program outcomes and baseline data. Applicant showed no evidence that a performance measurement system exists for providing information to HUD on progress made in achieving outcome goals.

### Subfactor 3-B, SECTION V(B) Rating Factor 3 (1)(b) of the IHDEP NOFA. Maximum Total Points: 7

#### **High Points (5-7)**

The applicant has **clearly documented** and designed major activities to meet measurable goals and objectives for drug related crime reduction. Outcomes include accomplishments, results in targeted area. The goals are objective, quantifiable, and/or qualitative.

#### **Medium Points (1-4)**

The applicant has **provided some evidence and documented** that they have designed major activities to meet measurable goals and objectives for drug related crime reduction. The applicant has some outcomes which may include accomplishments, results in targeted area.

#### Low Points (0)

The applicant **did not provide evidence or document** that they have designed major activities to meet measurable goals and objectives for drug related crime reduction. The applicant does not have outcomes which may include accomplishments, results in targeted area and the goals are not objective, quantifiable, and/or qualitative.

### Subfactor 3-C, SECTION V(B), Rating Factor 3 (1)(c) of the IHDEP NOFA. Maximum Total Points: 7

#### **High points (5-7)**

Applicant has **clearly defined specific crime reduction goals** that are measurable against the baseline year crime selection rate as stated in the application.

#### **Medium Points (1-4)**

Applicant **provided some examples** of crime reduction goals that are measurable against the baseline year crime selection rate as stated in the application.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant **did not provide specific crime reduction goals** that are measurable against the baseline year crime selection rate as stated in the application.

### Subfactor 3-D, SECTION V(B) Rating Factor 3 (1)(d) of the IHDEP NOFA - Maximum points: 7

#### **High points**(5-7)

Applicant **clearly** documents the rationale for proposed activities. Applicant demonstrates that the proposed activities have been effective in similar circumstances in controlling drug-related crimes.

#### **Medium Points (1-4)**

Applicant provides **some** evidence and rationale for proposed activities. Applicant demonstrates that the proposed activities have been effective in similar circumstances in controlling drug-related crimes.

#### Low points (0)

Applicant **did not** provide evidence or rationale for proposed activities. Applicant demonstrates that the proposed activities have been effective in similar circumstances in controlling drug-related crimes.

### **SUBFACTOR 3-E, SECTION V(B) Rating Factor 3 (1)(e) of the IHDEP NOFA.** Maximum points:7

#### **High Points (5-7)**

Applicant **clearly** demonstrates/provides evidence that youth programs and activities that reduce substance abuse among youth, aftercare services, social services, programs to reduce delinquency, gang prevention, academic improvement programs, counseling and conflict resolution, have been coordinated in the tribal community.

#### **Medium Points (1-4)**

Applicant provides **some** evidence and documentation that youth programs and activities that reduce substance abuse among youth, aftercare services, social services, programs to reduce delinquency, gang prevention, academic improvement programs, counseling and conflict resolution, have been coordinated in the tribal community.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant provides **little or no** evidence and documentation that youth programs and activities that reduce substance abuse among youth, aftercare services, social services, programs to reduce delinquency, gang prevention, academic improvement programs, counseling and conflict resolution, have been coordinated in the tribal community.

#### FOURTH SELECTIVE CRITERION. LEVERAGING RESOURCES

Subfactor 1—Proof Of Firm Commitments Maximum Allowable Points: 3

#### **High Points (3)**

Applicant **clearly demonstrated and provided** firm, written commitments of funding, staff, or in-kind resources, partnership agreements, and on-going or planned cooperative efforts. The MOAs/MOUs included organization name and resources. The applicant clearly described other partnerships, resident involvement and successful coordination of law enforcement and other activities.

#### **Medium Points (1-2)**

Applicant **provided satisfactory documentation**, written commitments; some of the following were provided: MOAs/MOUs include organization name and resources; description of other partnerships, resident involvement and coordination of law enforcement and other activities.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant **did not provide** any written commitments. MOAs/MOUs do not exist or are not signed; did not include organization name and resources; and the applicant did not describe other partnerships resident involvement and successful coordination of law enforcement and other activities.

Subfactor 2a—Residents, The Local Government And The Community Role In Planning The Proposed Activities.

**Maximum Allowable Points: 2** 

#### **High Points (2)**

Applicant **clearly demonstrated and provided** documentation of role residents, community leaders and organizations, law enforcement played in the targeted developments, and what role they will have in implementing such activities

#### **Medium Points (1)**

Applicant **provided satisfactory** documentation of role residents, community leaders and organizations, law enforcement played in the targeted developments, and what role they will have in implementing such activities.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant **did not provide** documentation of role residents, community leaders and organizations, law enforcement played in the targeted developments, and what role they will have in implementing such activities.

Subfactor 2b—Proof Of Resident, Local Government And Community Support In Planning And Implementing The Proposed Activities. Maximum Allowable Points: 2

#### **High Points (2)**

Applicant **clearly demonstrated and provided** discussion and written evidence (i.e. resident comments, community meeting minutes) of the extent to which community representatives and tribal, local, State and Federal Government officials, including law enforcement were actively involved in the design and implementation of the plan and will continue to be involved.

#### **Medium Points (1)**

Applicant **provided satisfactory** documentation of one of the following: a discussion or written evidence (i.e. resident comments, community meeting minutes) of the extent to which community representatives and tribal, local, State and Federal Governmental officials, including law enforcement were actively involved in plan design and implementation plan and will continue to be involved.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant **did not** describe or provide discussion or written evidence (i.e. comments form residents, minutes from community meetings) of the extent to which community representatives and tribal, local, State and Federal Government officials, including law enforcement were actively involved in the design and implementation of the plan and will continue to be involved.

### Subfactor 2c—Law Enforcement Obligations Maximum Allowable Points:3

#### **High Points (3)**

Applicant **clearly demonstrates** and provides evidence that relevant governmental jurisdiction has met the local law enforcement obligations under the Cooperation Agreement. Applicant has provided a description of baseline services being provided to the developments proposed for assistance.

#### **Medium Points (1-2)**

Applicant **provided satisfactory** evidence that relevant governmental jurisdiction has met the local law enforcement obligations under the Cooperation Agreement. Applicant provides some description of baseline services being provided to the developments proposed for assistance.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant **did not** demonstrate or provide any evidence that relevant governmental jurisdiction has met the local law enforcement obligations under the Cooperation Agreement. Applicant does not describe baseline services being provided to the developments proposed for assistance.

#### FIFTH SELECTIVE CRITERION COMPREHENSIVENESS AND COORDINATION MAXIMUM POINTS: 10

### **Subfactor 1—Demonstration Of Existing Coordination With Area Groups And Organizations—(4 points maximum)**

#### **High Points (3-4)**

Applicant **clearly demonstrates** existing and well-developed coordination of activities with area organizations and groups, which complement, support, and address community needs. The applicant describes and includes MOUs and MOAs that are or will be in place after award.

#### **Medium Points (1-2)**

Applicant **adequately demonstrates** some existing coordination of activities with area organizations and groups, which complement, support, and address community needs. The applicant describes and includes MOUs and MOAs that are or will be in place after award.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant **does not demonstrate** any coordination of activities with area organizations or groups. Applicant does not include or describe MOUs or MOAs.

### Subfactor 2. Participation In Tribe/TDHE's IHBG And Coordination Of Activities With IHP Plan—(3 points maximum)

#### **High Points (2-3)**

Applicant **clearly** demonstrates the steps taken to participate in the community's IHBG process and proves that proposed activities are consistent with the priorities, needs, concerns, and goals of crime prevention and safety in the community's Indian Housing Plan.

#### **Medium Points (1)**

Applicant **adequately** demonstrates the steps taken to participate in the community's IHBG process and proves that proposed activities are consistent with the priorities, needs, concerns, and goals of crime prevention and safety in the community's Indian Housing Plan.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant **does not** demonstrate or has not taken steps to participate in the community's IHBG process. Applicant does not prove that proposed activities are consistent with the priorities, needs, concerns, and goals of crime prevention and safety in the community's Indian Housing Plan.

### Subfactor 3. Steps Taken To Develop Federal, State, Local Or Other HUD Linkages To Promote Comprehensive Solutions—(3 Points Maximum)

#### **High Points (2-3)**

Applicant **clearly demonstrates** specific steps taken to develop linkages to coordinate comprehensive solutions with other HUD-funded projects/activities outside the scope of those covered by the IHP; and other Federal State, or locally funded activities, including those proposed, or on-going that will sustain a comprehensive system to address the needs of the community. Steps taken may include meetings, information networks, planning processes or other mechanisms.

#### **Medium Points (1)**

Applicant **adequately** demonstrates steps taken to develop linkages to coordinate comprehensive solutions with other HUD-funded projects/activities outside the scope of the IHP; or other Federal State, or locally funded activities.

#### Low Points (0)

Applicant **does not** demonstrate or has not taken steps to develop linkages with other HUD-funded projects/activities outside the scope of those covered by the IHP; or other Federal State, or locally funded activities.

Appendix 6: Formula Current Assisted Stock By Tribe

### Current Assisted Stock By Tribe (FY 2000 Final)

Office	Tribe	MH	LR	TK 3	FY00 fin	Adjustment
ALASKA	Afognak	0	0	0	0	
ALASKA	Ahtna Native Regional	62	67	0	129	
	Corporation					
ALASKA		0			0	
	Akiachak	0			0	
ALASKA		0	0		0	
ALASKA		0	0		0	
	Alakanuk	0	0		0	
ALASKA		0	0		0	
	Aleknagik	0	0		0	
	Aleutian Regional Corp.	262		0	313	
	Algaaciq (St. Mary's)	0			0	
	Allakaket	0	0		0	
ALASKA	Ambier Anaktuvuk Pass	0	0		0	
_		0	0		0	
ALASKA	Andreafski	0	0		0	
ALASKA	•	0	0		0	
	Annette Island (Metlakakla)	104			160	
ALASKA		0	0		0	
	Arctic Slope Native Regional	378		0	449	
	Corp.	370	, ,		449	
	Arctic Village	0			0	
ALASKA		0	0		0	
	Atmautluak	0	0		0	
	Atqasuk (Atkasook)	0	0		0	
ALASKA	Baranof Island Regional Corporation	67	20	0	87	
ALASKA	Barrow	0	0	0	0	
ALASKA	Beaver	0	0	0	0	
ALASKA	Belkofski	0	0	0	0	
ALASKA	Bering Straits Native Regional Corp.	537	44	0	581	
ALASKA	Bill Moore's Slough	0	0	0	0	
ALASKA		0				
	Brevig Mission	0	0			
ALASKA	_	349	57	0	406	-20
ALASKA	•	0	0	0	0	
ALASKA		1,306				
	Corporation	- ,		J	.,555	

ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA	Chalkyitsik Chanega Chefornak Chevak Chickaloon Chignik Chignik Lagoon Chignik Lake Chilkat Chilkoot Chistochina Chitina Chuatbaluk Chugach Native Regional	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 236
ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA	Circle Clark's Point	0 0 0 246	0 0 0 267	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 513
ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA	Council Craig Crooked Creek Curyung Deering Dot Lake Douglas	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 513	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 21	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 534
ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA	Eagle Eek Egegik Eklutna Ekuk Ekwok Elim Emmonak Evansville (Bettles Field) Eyak False Pass Fort Yukon Gakona Galena	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA	Kwethluk Kwigillingok Kwinhagak (Quinhagak) Larsen Bay Lesnoi (Woody Island) Levelock Lime Lower.Kalskag Manley Hot Springs Manokotak Marshall Mary's Igloo McGrath Mekoryuk Mentasta Minto Mountain Village Naknek NANA Native Regional	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
ALASKA	Napaimute Napakiak Napaskiak Nelson Lagoon Nenana New Stuyahok Newhalen Newtok Nightmute Nikolai Nikolski Ninilchik Noatuk Nome Nondalton Noorvik Northway Nuiqsut Nulato Nunapitchuk Ohogamiut Old Harbor		0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	

ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA	Ouzinkie Paimiut Pauloff Village Pedro Bay Perryville Petersburg Pilot Point Pilot Station Pitka's Point Platinum Point Hope Point Lay Port Graham Port Heiden Port Lions Portage Creek		
ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA ALASKA	Point) Qawalangin (Unalaska) Rampart Red Devil Ruby Russian Mission (Yukon) Saint George Saint Michael Saint Paul Salamatoff Savoonga Saxman Scammon Bay Selawik Seldovia Shageluk Shaktoolik Sheldon's Point Shishmaref Shungnak Skagway Sleetmute Solomon South Naknek Stebbins Stevens		

ALASKA	Takotna	0	0	0	0
ALASKA	Tanacross	0	0	0	0
ALASKA	Tanana	0	0	0	0
ALASKA	Tatitlek	0	0	0	0
ALASKA	Tazlina	0	0	0	0
ALASKA	Telida	0	0	0	0
ALASKA	Teller	0	0	0	0
ALASKA		0	0	0	0
ALASKA		433	179	0	612
ALASKA	3	0	0	0	0
	Toksook Bay	0	0	0	0
ALASKA	Tuluksak	0	0	0	0
	Tuntutuliak	0	0	0	0
ALASKA		0	0	0	0
ALASKA		0	0	0	0
ALASKA		Ö	0	0	0
ALASKA	· ·	Ö	0	0	0
ALASKA	3	0	0	0	0
ALASKA		0	0	0	0
ALASKA		0	0	0	0
ALASKA	S	0	0	0	0
ALASKA		Ö	0	0	0
ALASKA	Wales	0	0	0	0
ALASKA		0	0	0	0
ALASKA		0	0	0	0
ALASKA	J	0	0	0	0
CHICAG		0	66	0	66
0		· ·		•	
CHICAG	Bad River Band	24	167	12	203
0	20.0 1 0. 200				_00
CHICAG	Bay Mills Indian Community	135	70	0	205
0				•	_00
CHICAG	Boise Forte Band of Minnesota	22	42	30	94
0	Chippewa				
CHICAG	• •	40	34	0	74
0		. •	•		
CHICAG	Cayuga Nation	0	0	0	0
0		· ·	•	•	•
_	Coharie State Tribe	0	20	0	20
0		· ·			_•
CHICAG	Eastern Cherokee	796	125	0	921
0				_	
CHICAG	Fond Du Lac Band of	86	224	20	330
0	Minnesota Chippewa				
CHICAG	• •	52	7	0	59
	•				

0					
CHICAG O	Grand Portage Band of Minn. Chippewa	28	13	0	41
CHICAG O	Grand Traverse Band	0	60	0	60
CHICAG	Gun Lake Tribe	0	0	0	0
O CHICAG	Haliwa-Saponi State Tribe	0	30	0	30
O CHICAG	Hannahville Community	0	15	0	15
O CHICAG	Ho-Chunk Nation	26	152	0	178
O CHICAG	Houlton Band of Maliseets	15	75	0	90
O CHICAG	Huron Band of Potawatomi	0	0	0	0
O CHICAG	Keweenaw Bay Indian	15	252	0	267
0	Community				
CHICAG O	Lac Courte Oreilles	120	316	16	452
CHICAG	Lac Du Flambeau Band	133	193	1	327
O CHICAG	Lac Vieux Desert Band	8	35	0	43
O CHICAG	Leech Lake Band of Minnesota	157	313	0	470
O CHICAG	Chippewa Little River Band of Ottawa	0	0	0	0
0					
CHICAG O	Little Traverse Bay Band	0	0	0	0
	Lower Sioux	0	32	0	32
CHICAG O	Lumbee State Tribe	0	204	0	204
CHICAG	Menominee Indian Tribe	196	290	0	486
O CHICAG	Miccosukee Tribe	0	0	0	0
O CHICAG	Mille Lacs Band of Minnesota	20	115	0	135
O CHICAG	Chippewa Mississippi Choctaw Tribe	564	303	0	867
O CHICAG O	MOWA Band of Choctaw Indians	0	50	0	50

CHICAG O	Narragansett Tribe	0	0	0	0
CHICAG O	Oneida Nation of New York	0	30	0	30
CHICAG	Oneida Tribe	139	189	0	328
O CHICAG	Onondaga Nation	0	0	0	0
O CHICAG O	Passamaquody Indian Tribe	45	93	25	163
CHICAG	Penobscot Tribe	10	52	61	123
O CHICAG	Pleasant Point	77	36	50	163
O CHICAG	Poarch Band of Creek Indians	100	105	0	205
O CHICAG O	Pokagon Band of Potawatomi	0	0	0	0
CHICAG O	Prairie Island Sioux	0	24	0	24
CHICAG O	Red Cliff Band of Lake	18	115	8	141
CHICAG O	Superior Chippe Red Lake Band of Chippewa	175	297	5	477
CHICAG	Sac & Fox Tribe	0	20	0	20
O CHICAG	Saginaw Chippewa	44	72	0	116
O CHICAG O	Saint Croix Chippewa	32	174	7	213
CHICAG O	Sault Ste. Marie Tribe	34	398	0	432
_	Seminole Tribe	301	166	0	467
CHICAG	Seneca Nation of New York	5	211	95	311
O CHICAG O	Shakopee Sioux	0	0	0	0
CHICAG	Sokagoan Chippewa Tribe	11	121	0	132
_	St. Regis Mohawk Tribe	206	50	0	256
O CHICAG	Stockbridge-Munsee Tribe	36	26	34	96
O CHICAG	Tonawanda Band of Senecas	0	0	0	0

0							
	Tuscarora Nation	0	0	0	0		
0							
	Upper Sioux Indian Community	0	0	0	0		
0	Managaman Ciavan Ctata Triba	0	0	^	0		
CHICAG O	Waccamaw Siouan State Tribe	0	0	0	0		
	Wampanoag Tribe	0	18	0	18		
0	Wampanoag Tibo	J	10	Ü	10		
CHICAG	White Earth Band of Minnesota	107	243	18	368		
0	Chippewa						
DENVER	Blackfeet Tribe	553	604	0	1,157		
	Cheyenne River Sioux	256	594	51	901		
	Crow Creek Sioux	148	218	0	366		
	Crow Tribe	320	183	75	578		
	Devils Lake Sioux	110	328	33	471		
	Flandreau Santee Sioux	36	50	0	86		
	Fort Belknap Indian Community	378	249	0	627		
DENVER	Fort Peck Assiniboine and	484	542	55	1,081		
	Sioux						
	Ft. Berthold Affiliated Tribes	265	409	0	674		
	Goshute Reservation	4	8	0	12		
	Lower Brule Sioux	84	153	20	257		
	Northern Arapahoe	221	166	0	387		
	Northern Cheyenne	527	233	0	760	-9	
	NW Band of Shoshone Nation	0	13	0	13		
DENVER	Oglala Sioux of Pine Ridge	512	1,011	0	1,523		
	Reservation	00	000	_	000		
	Omaha Tribe	93	200	0	293		
	Ponca Tribe of Nebraska	35	38	0	73		
	Rocky Boy Chippewa-Cree	241	274	0	515		
	Rosebud Sioux	300	861	0	1,161		
	Salish and Kootenai Tribes	245	414	0	659		
	Santee Sioux Tribe	50	101	0	151		
DENVER	Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reser	157	136	0	293		
DENVER	Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux	153	538	0	691		
	Skull Valley Band of Goshute	0	0	0	0		
	Southern Ute Tribe	97	111	0	208		
	Standing Rock Sioux	284	597	37	918		
	Turtle Mountain Band of	682	842	15	1,539	-13	
	Chippewa			-	,		
DENVER	Uintah & Ouray Ute Indian Tribe	126	109	0	235		
	Utah Paiute Tribe	30	138	0	168		
DENVER	Ute Mountain Tribe	165	150	0	315		

DENVER	Winnebago Tribe Yankton Sioux	44 62	184 251	0 0	228 313	
OKLAHO MA	Absentee-Shawnee	532	195	0	727	
	Alabama-Coushatta	107	0	0	107	
	Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town	0	0	0	0	
	Apache Tribe	104	0	0	104	
	Caddo Tribe	186	20	0	206	-184
	Cherokee Nation	2,098	994	0	3,092	
	Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes	269	0	0	269	
	Chickasaw	1,048	754	0	1,802	
	Chitimacha Tribe	58	0	0	58	
	Choctaw Nation	1,984	146	0	2,130	
	Citizen Band Potawatomi Tribe	0	25	0	25	
	Comanche Tribe	414	140	0	554	
OKLAHO MA	Coushatta Tribe	16	0	0	16	
	Delaware Tribe	0	0	0	0	
OKLAHO MA	Delaware Tribe of Indians (Eastern)	132	77	0	209	
OKLAHO MA	Eastern Shawnee Tribe	0	0	0	0	
OKLAHO MA	Fort Sill Apache Tribe	0	0	0	0	
OKLAHO MA	lowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska	72	46	0	118	-38
OKLAHO MA	lowa Tribe of Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	
	Jena Band of Choctaw	0	0	0	0	
	Kaw Tribe	107	0	0	107	
	Kialegee Tribal Town	0	0	0	0	

B 4 0						
MA OKLAHO	Kickapoo Tribe	85	75	0	160	
MA	•					
OKLAHO MA	Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	
	Kiowa Tribe	151	0	0	151	
OKLAHO	Miami Tribe	0	0	0	0	
MA OKLAHO	Modoc Tribe	0	15	0	15	
MA						
OKLAHO MA	Muskogee (Creek) Nation	1,518	328	0	1,846	-239
	Osage Tribe	364	0	0	364	
OKLAHO	Otoe-Missouria Tribe	70	50	0	120	-70
	Ottawa Tribe	0	0	0	0	
MA OKLAHO	Pawnee Tribe	43	25	0	68	
MA OKLAHO	Peoria Tribe	309	123	0	432	
MA OKLAHO	Ponca Tribe	162	40	0	202	
MA						
MA	Prairie Band of Potawatomi	65	30	0	95	
OKLAHO MA	Quapaw Tribe	0	0	0	0	
OKLAHO MA	Sac and Fox of Missouri	19	20	0	39	
	Sac and Fox Tribe	343	45	0	388	
OKLAHO	Seminole Nation	106	26	0	132	
	Seneca-Cayuga	0	0	0	0	
MA OKLAHO	Texas Band of Kickapoo	0	20	0	20	
MA	Indians					
OKLAHO MA	Thlopthlocco Tribal Town	0	0	0	0	
	Tonkawa Tribe	35	50	0	85	
	Tunica-Biloxi Tribe	0	0	0	0	

United Keetoowah	0	0	0	0	
Wichita Tribe	59	40	0	99	
Wyandotte	0	0	0	0	
Acoma Pueblo	131	0	0	131	
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla	0	0	0	0	
Ak-Chin Papago	0	32	0	32	
Alturas Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
Auburn Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
Augustine Band of Cahuilla	0	0	0	0	
Barona Group of Capitan	53	0	0	53	
Grande					
Berry Creek Rancheria	17	23	0	40	
Big Lagoon Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
Big Pine Band	91	20	0	111	
Big Sandy Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
Big Valley Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
Blue Lake Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
Bridgeport Paiute Indian	0	21	0	21	
Colony Buena Vista Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
Cabazon Band	0	0	0	0	
Cahuilla Band	13	0	0	13	
Campo Band	22	33	U	55	
Cedarville Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
Chemehuevi	40	45	0	85	
	Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Ak-Chin Papago Alturas Rancheria Auburn Rancheria Augustine Band of Cahuilla Barona Group of Capitan Grande Berry Creek Rancheria Big Lagoon Rancheria Big Pine Band Big Sandy Rancheria Big Valley Rancheria Blue Lake Rancheria Bridgeport Paiute Indian Colony Buena Vista Rancheria Cabazon Band Cahuilla Band Campo Band Cedarville Rancheria	Wichita Tribe  Wyandotte  Acoma Pueblo  Acoma Pueblo  Ak-Chin Papago  Ak-Chin Papago  Alturas Rancheria  Auburn Rancheria  Augustine Band of Cahuilla  Barona Group of Capitan Grande Berry Creek Rancheria  Big Lagoon Rancheria  Big Sandy Rancheria  Big Sandy Rancheria  Big Valley Rancheria  Big Valley Rancheria  Bridgeport Paiute Indian Colony Buena Vista Rancheria  Cabazon Band  Cahuilla Band  Campo Band  Campo Band  Cedarville Rancheria  0	Wichita Tribe 59 40  Wyandotte 0 0  Acoma Pueblo 131 0  Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla 0 0  Ak-Chin Papago 0 32  Alturas Rancheria 0 0  Auburn Rancheria 0 0  Augustine Band of Cahuilla 0 0  Barona Group of Capitan Grande Berry Creek Rancheria 17 23  Big Lagoon Rancheria 0 0  Big Pine Band 91 20  Big Sandy Rancheria 0 0  Big Valley Rancheria 0 0  Big Valley Rancheria 0 0  Bridgeport Paiute Indian 0 0  Cabazon Band 13 0  Cahuilla Band 13 0  Campo Band 22 33  Cedarville Rancheria 0 0	Wichita Tribe 59 40 0  Wyandotte 0 0 0 0  Acoma Pueblo 131 0 0  Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla 0 0 0  Ak-Chin Papago 0 32 0  Alturas Rancheria 0 0 0 0  Auburn Rancheria 0 0 0 0  Augustine Band of Cahuilla 0 0 0 0  Augustine Band of Cahuilla 0 0 0 0  Barona Group of Capitan Grande Berry Creek Rancheria 17 23 0  Big Lagoon Rancheria 0 0 0 0  Big Pine Band 91 20 0  Big Sandy Rancheria 0 0 0 0  Big Valley Rancheria 0 0 0 0  Big Valley Rancheria 0 0 0 0  Bridgeport Paiute Indian 0 0 0  Colony Buena Vista Rancheria 0 0 0 0  Cabazon Band 13 0 0  Campo Band 22 33 0  Cedarville Rancheria 0 0 0 0	Wichita Tribe       59       40       0       99         Wyandotte       0       0       0       0         Acoma Pueblo       131       0       0       131         Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla       0       0       0       0         Ak-Chin Papago       0       32       0       32         Alturas Rancheria       0       0       0       0         Auburn Rancheria       0       0       0       0         Augustine Band of Cahuilla       0       0       0       0         Augustine Band of Capitlan Grande       53       0       0       0         Barona Group of Capitan Grande       53       0       0       53         Berry Creek Rancheria       17       23       0       40         Big Lagoon Rancheria       0       0       0       0         Big Sandy Rancheria       0       0       0       0         Big Valley Rancheria       0       0       0       0         Blue Lake Rancheria       0       0       0       0         Buena Vista Rancheria       0       0       0       0         Cabazon Band       13 </td

X PHOENI X	Chicken Ranch Rancheria	0	2	0	2
PHOENI	Chico Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Cloverdale Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Cochiti Pueblo	28	0	0	28
X PHOENI	Cocopah Tribe	32	75	0	107
X PHOENI	Cold Springs Rancheria	7	30	0	37
X PHOENI	Colorado River Indian Tribes	200	225	0	425
X PHOENI	Colusa Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Cortina Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Coyote Valley Band	0	30	0	30
X PHOENI	Cuyapaipe Community	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Death Valley Timba-Sha	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Dry Creek Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute	111	64	0	175
X PHOENI	Duckwater Shoshone	8	18	0	26
X PHOENI	Elk Valley Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Ely Shoshone	10	28	0	38
X PHOENI	Enterprise Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Fallon Paiute-Shoshone	112	57	0	169
X PHOENI	Fort Bidwell	35	6	0	41
X PHOENI	Fort Independence	11	1	0	12
X PHOENI	Fort McDermitt Paiute and	0	0	0	0
X	Shoshone	U	O	J	U

PHOENI X	Fort McDowell Mohave Apache	35	15	0	50
PHOENI	Fort Mojave Tribe	56	128	0	184
X PHOENI	Gila River	361	686	8	1,055
X PHOENI	Greenville Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Grindstone Rancheria	14	31	0	45
X PHOENI	Guidiville Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Havasupai	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Hoopa Valley	183	51	0	234
X PHOENI	Норі	335	20	0	355
X PHOENI	Hopland Rancheria	0	20	0	20
X PHOENI	Hualapai	163	135	0	298
X PHOENI	Inaja Band	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Ione Band of Miwok Indians	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Isleta Pueblo	91	0	0	91
X PHOENI	Jackson Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Jamul Indian Village	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Jemez Pueblo	60	0	0	60
X PHOENI	Jicarilla Reservation	100	138	0	238
X PHOENI	Kaibab Band of Paiute	33	25	0	58
X PHOENI	Karuk	5	95	0	100
X PHOENI	La Jolla Band	54	2	0	56
X PHOENI	La Posta Band	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Laguna Pueblo	194	39	0	233

V						
X PHOENI X	Las Vegas Colony	0	0	0	0	
PHOENI X	Laytonville Rancheria	2	31	0	33	
PHOENI X	Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone	40	10	0	50	
PHOENI X	Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla	0	0	0	0	
PHOENI X	Lovelock Colony	4	0	0	4	
PHOENI X	Lytton Rancheria of California	0	0	0	0	
PHOENI X	Manchester Point Arena Rancheria	11	38	0	49	
PHOENI X	Manzanita Band	0	0	0	0	
PHOENI X	Mesa Grande Band	0	22	0	22	
PHOENI X	Mescalero Reservation	35	311	0	346	
PHOENI X	Middletown Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
PHOENI X	Moapa Band of Paiute	10	39	0	49	
PHOENI X	Mooretown Rancheria	10	40	0	50	
PHOENI X	Morongo Band of Cahuilla	91	0	0	91	
PHOENI X	Nambe Pueblo	108	0	0	108	
PHOENI X	Navajo Nation	4,007	3,439	0	7,446	
PHOENI X	North Fork Rancheria	0	0	0	0	
PHOENI X	Paiute-Shoshone of Bishop Colony	158	65	0	223	
PHOENI X	Pala Bank	89	12	0	101	-27
PHOENI X	Pascua Yaqui Tribe	380	383	0	763	
PHOENI X	Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indian	0	0	0	0	
PHOENI X	Pauma Band	19	0	0	19	

PHOENI X	Payson Tonto Apache	0	0	0	0
PHOENI	Pechanga Band	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Picayune Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI X	Picuris Pueblo	27	0	0	27
PHOENI	Pinoleville Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Pit River Tribe	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI X	Pojoaque Pueblo	42	0	0	42
PHOENI X	Potter Valley Rancheria	0	0	0	0
PHOENI	Pyramid Lake Paiute	205	58	0	263
X PHOENI	Quartz Valley Reservation	0	1	0	1
X PHOENI	Quechan Tribe	207	79	0	286
X PHOENI X	Ramona Band	0	0	0	0
PHOENI X	Redding Rancheria	0	0	0	0
PHOENI	Redwood Valley Rancheria	16	9	0	25
X PHOENI X	Reno-Sparks Colony	122	78	0	200
PHOENI	Resighini Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Rincon Reservation	82	15	0	97
X PHOENI	Robinson Rancheria	30	11	0	41
X PHOENI	Rohnerville Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Round Valley Reservation	63	51	0	114
X PHOENI	Rumsey Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Salt River Plma-Maricopa	318	153	0	471
X PHOENI	San Carlos Apache	464	424	0	888

Χ					
PHOENI X	San Felipe Pueblo	10	0	0	10
PHOENI X	San Ildefonso Pueblo	105	0	0	105
PHOENI X	San Juan Pueblo	133	10	0	143
PHOENI	San Juan Southern Paiute	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Tribe San Manuel Band	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	San Pasqual Band	54	10	0	64
X PHOENI	San Rosa Band of Cahuilla	5	0	0	5
X PHOENI	San Ysabel Reservation	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Sandia Pueblo	33	1	0	34
X PHOENI	Santa Ana Pueblo	22	0	0	22
X PHOENI	Santa Clara Pueblo	130	0	0	130
X PHOENI	Santa Rosa Rancheria	2	43	0	45
X PHOENI	Santa Ynez Band of Chumash	45	22	0	67
X PHOENI	Santo Domingo Pueblo	41	32	0	73
X PHOENI	Scotts Valley (Pomo)	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Sheep Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Sherwood Valley Rancheria	16	19	0	35
X PHOENI	Shingle Springs Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Smith River Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Soboba Band	85	8	0	93
X PHOENI	Stewarts Point Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI X	Sulphur Bank Rancheria	0	0	0	0

PHOENI X	Summit Lake Paiute Tribe	0	0	0	0
PHOENI	Susanville Rancheria	53	31	0	84
X PHOENI	Sycuan Band	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Table Bluff Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Table Mountain Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Taos Pueblo	159	0	0	159
X PHOENI	Te-Moak	223	59	0	282
X PHOENI	Tesuque Pueblo	32	0	0	32
X PHOENI	Tohono O'Odham Nation	811	122	0	933
X PHOENI	Torres-Martinez Band of	26	11	0	37
X PHOENI	Cahuilla Trinidad Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Tule River Indian Tribe	50	7	0	57
X PHOENI	Tulomne Rancheria	14	7	0	21
X PHOENI	Twenty Nine Palms Band	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Upper Lake Rancheria	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Utu Utu Gwaiti Paiute	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Viejas Group of Capitan	42	12	0	54
X PHOENI	Grande Walker River Paiute Tribe	128	46	0	174
X PHOENI	Washoe Tribe	150	80	0	230
X PHOENI	White Mountain Apache (Fort	800	448	0	1,248
X PHOENI	Apache) Winnemucca Colony	0	0	0	0
X PHOENI	Yavapai-Apache (Camp	68	83	0	151
X PHOENI	Verde) Yavapai-Prescott	0	0	0	0

Χ						
PHOENI X	Yerington Paiute Tribe	54	15	0	69	
PHOENI X	Yomba Shoshone Tribe	0	22	0	22	
PHOENI X	Ysleta Del Sur	136	0	0	136	
PHOENI X	Yurok Tribe	0	0	0	0	
PHOENI X	Zia Pueblo	45	0	0	45	
PHOENI X	Zuni Tribe	431	167	45	643	
SEATTL E	Burns-Paiute Colony	18	0	0	18	
SEATTL E	Chehalis Confederated Tribes	25	54	0	79	
SEATTL E	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	138	86	0	224	
SEATTL E	Colville Confederated Tribes	178	262	0	440	
SEATTL E	Coos Bay Confederated Tribes	0	0	0	0	
SEATTL E	Coquille Indian Tribe	20	51	0	71	
SEATTL E	Cowlitz Tribe	0	0	0	0	
SEATTL E	Fort Hall Shoshone-Bannock	191	94	0	285	
SEATTL E	Grand Ronde Confederated Tribes	0	0	0	0	
SEATTL E	Hoh Indian Tribe	19	0	0	19	
SEATTL E	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	0	0	0	0	
SEATTL E	Kalispel Indian Community	21	0	0	21	
SEATTL E	Klamath Indian Tribe	5	31	0	36	
SEATTL E	Kootenai Tribe	25	0	0	25	
SEATTL E	Lower Elwha Tribal Community	103	0	0	103	10
SEATTL E	Lummi Tribe	132	199	0	331	

SEATTL E	Makah Indian Tribe	204	42	0	246
SEATTL E	Muckleshoot Indian Tribe	0	40	0	40
SEATTL E	Nez Perce Tribe	197	90	0	287
SEATTL E	Nisqually Indian Community	92	0	0	92
SEATTL E	Nooksack Tribe	114	7	0	121
SEATTL E	Port Gamble Indian Community	20	35	0	55
SEATTL E	Puyallup Tribe	43	27	0	70
SEATTL E	Quileute Tribe	62	3	0	65
SEATTL E	Quinault Tribe	74	50	0	124
SEATTL E	Samish Nation	0	0	0	0
SEATTL E	Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe	20	0	0	20
SEATTL E	Shoalwater Bay Tribe	13	0	0	13
SEATTL E	Siletz Confederated Tribes	54	51	0	105
SEATTL E	Skokomish Indian Tribe	74	0	0	74
SEATTL E	Spokane Tribe	185	106	0	291
SEATTL E	Squaxin Island Tribe	65	19	0	84
SEATTL E	Stillaguamish Tribe	30	0	0	30
SEATTL E	Suquamish Tribal Council	63	9	0	72
SEATTL E	Swinomish Indians	20	79	6	105
SEATTL E	Tulalip Tribes	132	158	0	290
SEATTL E	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	92	130	0	222
SEATTL E	Upper Skagit Tribe	50	26	0	76
SEATTL	Warm Springs Confederated	103	100	0	203

E Tribes
SEATTL Yakima Indian Nation 411 272 0 683
E 73,053 -590

Appendix 7:
IHDEP Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)
May 11, 2000

Appendix 8:
Amendment to IHDEP NOFA,
June 9, 2000